

## REMARKS

A current and Non-final Office Action is dated 01/17/2006. The current Office Action examined claims 1-32. Claims 1-32 were rejected.

This current Reply is responsive to the current Office Action. In this current Reply, claims 14-18 are canceled, and claims 33-35 are added. Hence, claims 1-13 and 19-35 are now pending and presented for examination.

On pages 2-3 in paragraph #5, the current Office Action rejected claims 6-11 "under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention." In response, it is respectfully submitted that it is permissible for an optional element to be amended into a claim during prosecution without their being any presumption that such an optional element is therefore essential. Consequently, when the Office disagreed with Applicant's position that the added element rendered the claim patentable, Applicants elected to remove the element without prejudice so as to avoid obfuscating the issues before the Office.

On pages 3-6 in paragraph #6 part A, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-32 "under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

1 regards as the invention.” In response, claims have been amended as indicated  
2 above. For example, ‘single session’ has been removed. Also, ‘user interaction’ has  
3 been clarified with regard to, e.g., a ‘remote device’. Moreover, examples of ‘user  
4 interaction’ have been illuminated with dependent claims 7, 20, and 33-35. It is  
5 respectfully submitted that any 112, second paragraph, issues that previously existed  
6 have been remedied, and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested.

7 On pages 6-7 in paragraph #6 part B, the current Office Action rejected  
8 claims 12, 21, and 27 “under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite  
9 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which  
10 applicant regards as the invention.” It is respectfully submitted that any 112, second  
11 paragraph, antecedent basis issues that previously existed have been remedied, and  
12 withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested.

13  
14  
15 The claims were variously rejected using Aharoni et al., McCanne, Borella et  
16 al., Zeineh, and Gai et al. Although Applicant disagrees with the positions taken by  
17 the Office with these rejections, the claims have been amended as indicated above to  
18 narrow the issues before the Office in the instant Patent Application and to thereby  
19 expedite the prosecution and ultimate allowance of the instant Patent Application.  
20 However, Applicants reserve the right to pursue other subject-matters disclosed  
21 and/or currently or previously claimed in the instant Patent Application in one or  
22 more continuing patent applications.

1 None of the applied art describes or suggests classifying or prioritizing  
2 information based on a user interaction at a remote/host device.

3  
4 Accordingly, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates  
5 or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other  
6 elements of their respective claims:

7 Claim 1: *classifying information within each elementary stream based on*  
8 *importance and responsive to the compressed video objects as affected*  
9 *by at least one user interaction via a remote device that is operatively*  
10 *coupled across a network.*

11 Claim 6: generating resource coordination information based at least in part  
12 on at least one prioritizing parameter associated with an application  
13 communicating the content information and on *one or more*  
14 *prioritizing parameters associated with a user interaction via a remote*  
15 *device that is operatively coupled to a network.*

16 Claim 12: generating prioritization information based at least in part on at  
17 least one parameter associated with an application streaming media  
18 information and on *one or more prioritizing parameters associated*  
19 *with a user interaction via a remote device that is operatively coupled*  
20 *to a network.*

21 Claim 19: collaborator logic operatively coupled to the packetizer logic and  
22 configured to receive at least one prioritizing parameter associated  
23 with at least one application [...] and *one or more prioritizing*  
24 *parameters associated with a user interaction via a remote device that*  
25 *is operatively coupled to a network; the collaborator logic further*

1 configured to output resource coordination information based at least  
2 in part on the at least one prioritizing parameter associated with the  
3 application and the *one or more prioritizing parameters associated*  
4 *with the user interaction.*

5 Claim 25: . . . the *second host device receiving a user interaction* [...]  
6 wherein the first application-aware resource controller is configured  
7 [...] to map the aggregated information to at least two service classes  
8 selected from a group of two or more different service classes based at  
9 least in part on *one or more prioritizing parameters associated with*  
10 *the user interaction.*

11  
12  
13 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, 12, 19, and 25 have  
14 been provided above. Claims 2-5/33, 7-11, 13/34, 20-24, and 26-32/35 depend from  
15 the independent claims 1, 6, 12, 19, and 25, respectively. Although each also  
16 includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, it is respectfully  
17 submitted that these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given  
18 above in connection with their respective independent claims.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

3  
4  
5

6  
7  
8

11

12

12

13

14